



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.

REPLY TO GEN. BEAUREGARD.

My attention has lately been called to the letters of General G. T. Beauregard and Rear-Admiral Wm. Rogers Taylor in the July and October (1886) and March (1887) numbers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

As my book, entitled "Recollections of a Naval Officer," is frequently mentioned in these letters, I feel myself called upon to make a few corrections.

Rear-Admiral Taylor in his first letter attempts to prove his statements by extracts from my book. That these extracts are garbled no fair man can deny after reading the book in question (1.) The Admiral says: "A book entitled 'Recollections of a Naval Officer' written by Captain Wm. Harwar Parker, who at the time in question was first-lieutenant of the 'Palmetto State' says that the statement accompanying the proclamation of General Beauregard and Commodore Ingraham, viz.: that 'the British Consul and the Commander of the British war steamer "Petrel" had previously gone five miles beyond the usual anchorage of the blockaders, and could see nothing of them with their glasses was a foolish statement.'"

What I *did* say was: "The Charleston papers said: 'The British Consul, with the Commander of the British war steamer 'Petrel,' had previously gone five miles beyond the usual anchorage of the blockaders, and could see nothing of them with their glasses.' I do not understand that General Beauregard and Flag-Officer Ingraham indorsed this foolish statement in their proclamation. *The 'Petrel' was not there.*"

(2) Again, the Admiral quotes: "As we entered the harbor the Federal vessels closed in and resumed the blockade."

This I said, but only after having shown that the Federal fleet was dispersed and driven off, as stated in the proclamation. I said "The enemy's ships went off to the southward and eastward, and there they remained hull-down for the remainder of the forenoon." The point of difference between what the proclamation said and what I remembered was as to whether the vessels went entirely out of sight, or hull down with their masts visible through the glasses! I presume the masts were not visible to the naked eye, and I do not know but that they were entirely out of sight at some time during the day. I *should* doubtless have written "after we entered the harbor the Federal fleet closed in," etc., but I was not paying much attention to the time when the blockade was renewed, but simply attempting to describe the events of the day. In any event, the fact that I said the "Federal vessels *closed in*" showed that they had gone outside their old anchorage, which fact Admiral Taylor denies.

(3) The Admiral quotes me as saying "as to the proclamation in regard to the blockade being broken, I looked upon it as *all bosh*. No vessels went out or came in during the day."

This I wrote; not that I disputed the fact that the blockade *was* broken, for I had already showed that it was. What I meant to say was that I considered it ill-advised, inasmuch as I did not believe the English Government would recognize it (as indeed it did not). This is clearly to be inferred from my previous remarks.

It is true no vessels went out or came in during the day; but any number of vessels could have done so, and that without any opposition on the part of the enemy. And this, too, clearly appears in my description of the battle.

The word "*bosh*" was certainly ill-chosen by me, as it might be construed as a want of respect to General Beauregard and Commodore Ingraham, which was very far from my intention.

(4) The Admiral further quotes me as saying: "I am constrained to say that

this was a badly managed affair on our part, and we did not make the best use of our opportunity."

This I said, but only after showing *why* I thought it badly managed, and this was that we should have remained near the "Mercedita," and in the dark captured the other vessels as they came up, for the reason that as soon as day broke they would discover the strength of our vessels and run away—which they promptly did.

Finally, if any one will take the trouble to read my account of this affair off Charleston ("Recollections," page 294), he will see that the only point on which I differ with General Beauregard is as to whether the enemy's vessels were driven entirely out of sight. I only assume to give my recollection. I distinctly remember to have viewed the enemy's vessels at some time during the forenoon. My attention was specially called to them by Lieutenant Shryock. I looked through a glass and they were hull down, with their masts barely visible.

That they were not at some time during the day entirely out of sight I cannot say; neither can I say at what time they took up their old anchorages, for I was at that time in Charleston Harbor and could not see.

General Beauregard asserts that the enemy's ships were driven entirely out of sight, and Commodore Ingraham said in a dispatch written while outside the bar and with the foreign consuls on board: "The blockading fleet has gone to the southward and eastward out of sight."

Admiral Taylor having so freely noticed my book, I may be allowed a few remarks bearing upon his letters:

(1) The Admiral (taking care to explain that "picking up" an anchor means hauling in and securing the cable and remaining in the same position as before slipping) says:

"The 'Housatonic' picked up her anchor in the course of the afternoon."

How is it then that her log shows she *did not* pick up her anchor, but remained under weigh certainly till 8 P. M.? [See Sec. Navy's Report, 1863.]

(2) The Admiral says: "The 'Quaker City' picked up her anchor in the course of the forenoon."

The "Quaker City" *weighed* her anchor and ran off with it to the southward and eastward, as her log will no doubt show.

(3) How many miles off must Colonel Leckler have been, when, on a bright, clear day, he required a glass to see Fort Sumter and to be told that it *was* Fort Sumter?

(4) Does not the log of the "Housatonic" show that she was outside her anchorage and had to *stand in* to look for it? [Sec. Navy's Report, 1863.]

(5) Why was it necessary to send Captains Turner and Godon "to investigate the whole matter?" and why, when the "indignant protest" was drawn up, (and which simply charged the foreign consuls, General Beauregard, Commodore Ingraham and Captain Tucker with wholesale lying), why, I repeat, was it found necessary to obtain the signatures of at least two, if not three, captains *who were not there*, and who could have had no personal knowledge of what transpired after, say, eight o'clock of the morning of that day?

WM. HARWAR PARKER.

V.

OLD YACHTS AND NEW.

THE recent races for the America's Cup have excited such universal interest that it may not be untimely to remind enthusiastic yachtsmen that we are at this